Appl. No. 10/539,358
Response to final Office action of 5 April 2010

Reply under 37 CFR 1.116
Expedited Procedure – TC 3621

Page 6 of 8

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-14 and 19-24 are pending in the application.

Claim 23 is amended herein to correct a typographical error, and to place the claims in better condition for allowance or appeal. No new matter is added, and the intended scope of the claim is unchanged.

The Examiner rejects claims 6 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With regard to claim 6, the Examiner asserts "it is not clear how the method of claim 1 is creating "a domain of a plurality of devices...". This assertion is confusing, because claim 1 does not create a domain; claim 6 creates a domain.

The Examiner further asserts "It is not clear if ... the Applicant is claiming grouping of devices of the client system claimed in claim 1". This assertion is also confusing, because claim 6 clearly recites "creating a domain of a plurality of devices of the set of devices", and claim 1 provides the antecedent basis for the set of devices.

Because claim 6 clearly recites creating a domain of a plurality of devices of the set of devices defined in claim 1, the applicants respectfully maintain that there is no ambiguity in this claim, and that the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is unfounded.

With regard to claim 10, the Examiner asserts "it is not clear if the claim language is meant to recite signing the already signed partial right "a second time" by the machine of the provider or the partial right is signed for the second time by a device at a client site.

Appl. No. 10/539,358   Reply under 37 CFR 1.116
Response to final Office action of 5 April 2010   Expedited Procedure – TC 3621

Page 7 of 8

Claim 10 clearly recites "allowing the device to: identify a different device, sign at least one partial right of the set of signed partial rights to create at least one other signed partial right; and transfer the at least one other signed partial right to the different device", and claim 1 identifies the device being at the client site. It is clear from claim 10 that the device at the client site is performing the signing, and that the item being signed is one of the set of signed partial rights.

Because claim 10 clearly recites that the device at the client site signs a signed partial right, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is unfounded, and should be withdrawn.

The Examiner rejects:

claims 1-12, 14, and 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Richards et al. (WO 01/63387, hereinafter Richards), in view of Okamoto et al. (USPA 2004/0054678, hereinafter Okamoto) and Tadayon (USPA 2005/0187877); and

claims 13, 21, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Richards, Okamoto, and Tadayon, in view of Lambert (USP 7,509,421). The applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the reasons stated in the applicants' prior response.

As noted in the prior response, the combination of Richards, Okamoto, and Tadayon fails to teach or suggest separately digitally signing each of a set of partial rights, as claimed by the applicants, and the Examiner has failed to show where the separate digital signing of partial rights from a decomposed usage right is taught or suggested in any of these cited references. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejections of claims 1-14 and 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is unfounded, and should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/539,358
Response to final Office action of 5 April 2010

Reply under 37 CFR 1.116
Expedited Procedure – TC 3621

Page 8 of 8

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application to be in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707
for: Kevin C. Ecker
Reg. 43,600
914-333-9618

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
PHILIPS IP&S
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
914-332-0222